

Remarks/Arguments

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow.

1. Amendments to the Specification

In the Office Action the Examiner has indicated that the listing of references in the specification is not a proper Information Disclosure Statement.

With this response, applicant submits a proper Information Disclosure Statement on which the references listed in the specification are found for proper consideration by the Examiner.

Further, the Examiner has objected to the language of the abstract as incorporating language or phrases which is unsuitable for an Abstract.

With this response, applicant has amended the abstract in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions to remove the indicated language.

As a result, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification, and particularly the abstract.

2. Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action the Examiner has objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objection to the drawings. More specifically, because claim 15 lists a safety pin which is a feature recited in claim 15 that is shown in the drawing figures. Because the safety pin recited in claim 15 is illustrated in Fig. 13, in applicant's opinion the features of claim 15 are shown in the drawing figures and the Examiner's objection to the drawing figures is not proper. As a result, applicant believes that the drawing figures show each and every feature recited in the claims, and specifically claim 15, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

3. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 5, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections to claims 5, 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. More specifically, with this response applicant has amended claims 5 and 6 to specify that the optically clear adhesive recited in claim 1 is a first layer of the optically clear adhesive. Further, claims 5 and 6 have been amended to specify that the optically clear adhesive recited in these claims is a second layer of the optically clear adhesive. Therefore, claims 5, 6 and 11 are definite with regard to specifying the particular layer of the optically clear adhesive to which each of these claims are referring. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 5, 6 and 11.

Conclusion

It is submitted that claims 1-16 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and each defines patentable subject matter. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

No fee is believed to be payable with this communication. Nevertheless, should the Examiner consider any other fees to be payable in conjunction with this or any future communication, the Commissioner is authorized to direct payment of such fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1170.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it would help expedite the prosecution and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy E. Newholm
Registration No. 34,400

Dated: April 6, 2004

USPTO Customer No. 23,598
Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm,
Stein & Gratz, S.C.
250 Plaza Building, Suite 1030
250 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202
Telephone: (414) 225-9755
Facsimile: (414) 225-9753
Email: ten@boylefred.com